UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

| APPLICATION NO.       | FILING DATE                   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/661,741            | 09/12/2003                    | Simon Tong           | 16113-001001        | 8303             |
| 26192<br>FISH & RICHA | 7590 09/20/2007<br>ARDSON P.C |                      | EXAMINER            |                  |
| PO BOX 1022           |                               |                      | LEWIS, CHERYL RENEA |                  |
| MINNEAPOLI            | IS, MN 55440-1022             |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                       |                               |                      | 2167                |                  |
|                       |                               |                      |                     |                  |
|                       |                               |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                       |                               | •                    | 09/20/2007          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

|   |   |   | <i>N</i> . |
|---|---|---|------------|
|   | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  | A          |
|   | 10/661,741  | TONG ET AL.   | •          |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner  | Art Unit  |            |
| •   | Cheryl Lewis  | 2167  |            |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply   | appears on the cover sheet w  | ith the correspondence addr   | ess        |
|   | DIVIC CET TO EVOIDE OF  | AONTHICO OD THIDTY (20)   | DAVC       |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three-months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | S DATE OF THIS COMMUNI R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI atute, cause the application to become A | ICATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this commodities. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |            |
| Status  |   |   |            |
| 1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2   | 2 June 2007.  |   | •          |
|   | This action is non-final.   |   |            |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allo  | wance except for formal mat   | ters, prosecution as to the n   | nerits is  |
| closed in accordance with the practice und  | er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.I  | D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |            |
| Disposition of Claims   |   |   |            |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-46</u> is/are pending in the applicat   | tion.   |   |            |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with   |   | •   |            |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |   |   |            |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-46</u> is/are rejected.   |   |   | •          |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |   |   |            |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar   | nd/or election requirement.   |   | •          |
| Application Papers  |   |   |            |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Exam   | niner.  |   |            |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)  |   | by the Examiner.  |            |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to   |   | •   |            |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor  | rrection is required if the drawing   | g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR   | 1.121(d).  |
| 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the  | Examiner. Note the attache  | d Office Action or form PTO   | -152.      |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |   |   |            |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore  | eign priority under 35 U.S.C.   | § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  |            |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  |   |   |            |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority docum   | ents have been received.  | •   | •          |
| <ol><li>Certified copies of the priority docum</li></ol>  | ents have been received in A  | Application No  |            |
| <ol><li>Copies of the certified copies of the p</li></ol>   | •   | received in this National St  | tage       |
| application from the International Bu   |   |   |            |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a   | list of the certified copies no   | t received.   |            |
| •   |   |   |            |
|   |   |   |            |
| Attachment(s)   |   | •   |            |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   |   | Summary (PTO-413)<br>(s)/Mail Date  | •          |
| <ol> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> </ol>   |   | Informal Patent Application   | •          |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/6/2005</u> .   | 6) 🔲 Other:   | ·   |            |

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/661,741

Art Unit: 2167

## **DETAILED ACTION**

- This Office Action is in response to the applicants' communication received on June 22, 2007.
- 2. Claims 1, 23, 24, and 36 are presented for examination. Applicants have not cancelled nor added any new claims.
- 3. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-46 have been considered but they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

## **Double Patenting**

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/661,741

Art Unit: 2167

5. Claims 1-46 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-58 of copending Application No. 10/661748. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claim limitations of claims 1-46 of the instant applicant, particularly the independent claims and the claim limitations of copending application no. 10/661748 recite similar claim limitations.

For instance, the only difference between the limitations of claim 1 of the instant application and claim 1 of copending application 10/661748 is that claim 1 of copending application 10/661748 states "a second search query", whereas the limitations of claim 1 of the instant application and the limitations of claim 1 of copending application 10/661748 are the same.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

## NAME OF CONTACT

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl Lewis whose telephone number is (571) 272-4113. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2167

(571) 273-4113 (Use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper/amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions.).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/ Technology Center (571) 272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Cheryl Lewis/ Patent Examiner, A.U. 2167 September 17, 2007